

than when he came. I can say without equivocation Gary Sisco has met that test. It has been my pleasure to work with him. I have come to admire him and respect him, and I also respect the position he has taken with regard to this particular resignation.

I confirm exactly what Senator LOTT has just noted, that because of my respect, not only for Senator LOTT but for Gary Sisco and the Sergeant at Arms, it was my view, in keeping the continuity of the officers of the Senate, as well as because they were serving us so well, they had every right and could have every expectation that regardless of what may happen to the majority in the Senate, they would have the full confidence and have the full support of both caucuses for the duration of this Congress.

Gary Sisco has made his decision, and I respect it, but I do so with a great deal of appreciation. I do so with the hope that he will come back often. I do so with a realization that in this business we get to work with quality people, people who give back to their country, to their community, and to each of us in ways that I think is admirable. He has done so. Our country owes him a debt of gratitude. This Senate owes him a debt of gratitude.

On behalf of our caucus, I thank him for all he has given us. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again, I thank Senator DASCHLE for coming to the Chamber and making that statement, and I look forward to working with him and the new Secretary of the Senate to continue the very efficient and fine way the Senate has been conducted, in the way the Office of the Secretary of the Senate has been run. I know she will do a great job.

Mr. President, I do not know who is controlling the time now, but I want to be yielded time to speak against the pending amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for 1 minute to comment on Mr. Sisco?

Mr. LOTT. I will be happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I yield to Senator SESSIONS from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Republican leader and the Democratic leader and others for their kind comments about Gary Sisco.

In short, he is one of the finest people I know. He served the Senate with great integrity, ability, and fidelity. He has a wonderful family, high personal values, the kind of person you like to know, like to call your friend, you want to have in your home. He has served so well, and he leaves with grace and style quite in harmony with his whole lifestyle. I thank Senator LOTT

for raising this point, and I join in his compliments.

Mr. LOTT. I believe the time has been off the leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 893

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the pending amendment. My question is, If we are not going to have exploration in the Gulf of Mexico in a limited area for oil and gas, where are we going to do it? Not in the Atlantic along the coast. Not in the Pacific along the coast. Some people say not in Alaska in the area that has been pursued. Then where? I believe we can do it effectively, efficiently, responsibly, and productively in the Gulf of Mexico.

For years, exploration in the gulf and, in fact, drilling activity occurred primarily in Texas and Louisiana waters. But in more recent years it has moved over under Mississippi and Alabama. It has been very productive.

This is an interesting map to which others have referred. The Florida coastline goes to Pensacola, Alabama with Mobile, Biloxi, and New Orleans. I live right here; that is where my house sits. I can step off my front porch and put a rock in the Gulf of Mexico. I can sit out on my front porch and I can see a natural gas well working right in this area. In the daytime you can see it. It is clear. And at night sometimes they flare it off. It has never been a problem and it is producing natural gas. As a matter of fact, it is closer to my front doorstep, literally, than it is to Panama City, Florida, or Pensacola, or Biloxi or New Orleans. I am perfectly comfortable with this. There is no risk.

Those who live in the gulf area know that some of the most effective drilling and exploration drilling anywhere in the world is done in the gulf. It has become more efficient, with greater accuracy. If there has ever been a spill in the gulf, it must have been very minor and certainly never affected my State. I don't believe, since we have had the drilling off the coast of Alabama and Mississippi. I don't believe we have ever had one.

It also is a wonderful place to fish around the oil rigs. We take old liberty ships out and sink them in the gulf so they will form fishing mounds. It is very effective. The rig serves the same purpose.

But now we have people who say we should not have it in the Gulf of Mexico, or we should delay it even further, even though there has been a compromise. I think this whole area should be opened up for lease. But now it is down to just this green area, a very small area. The Governors of the States that are involved—Louisiana,

Mississippi, Alabama, and I believe this compromise provision is supported even by Jeb Bush—all of our leaders and all of the people who live in this area support this.

What are we going to do? We are depending on foreign oil for 56 percent of our energy needs, and it is going up. It will be 60 percent. Can we get everything we need just from wind and sun? If we triple what we got from those areas, it wouldn't get us at 6 percent. As I said before, maybe we will have to harness some of the speeches around here to produce more energy needs in this country. But we need exploration for oil and gas. We need to look at greater use of nuclear power. We need to take advantage of clean coal technology. We do need alternative sources of energy—wind, solar, hydro. We need energy efficiency. We need to encourage conservation. But we need a national energy policy—the whole thing, the whole package—so that we will not be in danger of the threat of OPEC countries saying they will cut us off.

By the way, every time we have a decline or some sort of a threat from OPEC countries, we get oil out of the SPR. Where do you think the SPR is, the strategic petroleum? I think most of it is in Texas and Louisiana.

Now people are saying, well, in south Florida, let's build a 1.6 billion pipeline from my hometown and from Mobile, AL, across the Gulf of Mexico into Florida and supply their energy needs. We are supposed to take the risk in those areas of the exploration and the drilling for natural gas, and of course, sometimes for oil, and now we are going to build this pipeline and lay it across the Gulf of Mexico to supply the natural gas for people who say they don't want us to explore and produce. This makes no sense.

The people have to decide. Are we going to continue to go down this trail of not producing for our energy needs? Are we going to have this national security risk, facing the danger of loss of freedoms in America? Who thinks gasoline prices will not go up again next summer? They are. And so will diesel fuel prices. The families won't be able to afford to drive to their vacation spots. The small business men and women are going to have trouble paying their electricity bills. The farmers will have difficulty paying for the cost of diesel fuel for their tractors. It will ripple through the economy.

This is probably the most serious problem this country faces today. Meanwhile, we fiddle in Washington while the country has a heat stroke and is threatened with not having the energy to keep the economy growing. I think the American people realize this is a very serious problem. Some people shy away from calling it a crisis. OK, don't use that word. There is no imminent danger now. But there could be tomorrow, there could be next week.

OPEC countries could say: We will cut you off. We could have rolling brown-outs in California, blackouts in New York City. They will run short of power in south Florida.

This is the least we can do. We should do it now, not later. We have been wrestling around over this for months—in fact, years. This can be done safely, effectively. I understand it is projected this area could produce enough natural gas to provide 1 million families in America with the supply of natural gas they need for 15 years. I don't know whether that is accurate. It has been very productive in this part of the gulf. It is done efficiently and in very targeted ways. They know now where the oil and gas is. They can probably put a pin on it—and from long distances.

I urge my colleagues, this may be the only real vote we have on energy production in America this summer. Senator DASCHLE said we will focus on appropriations bills. He is right for doing that. We should try to help him move the appropriations bills. We will not get to a free-standing energy bill probably until the fall. But we should do it. In the meantime, we should not take this step of prohibiting or delaying exploration and development of the resources that we know are in the Gulf of Mexico.

My beach is closer to this area than the beaches in Florida. I say, bring it on. I am worried about the future of my country and my children's economic future. I urge my colleagues, this should be an overwhelming bipartisan defeat on an amendment that really, in view of all that has gone on, should not be passed.

I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding me this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, such time as he consumes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleague from Florida, Senator BILL NELSON, as we offer this amendment to help assure that America will have a policy of energy that is also a policy for our economic future and for the protection of important environmental treasures.

Let us clearly understand what the amendment we offer will do. It will provide for a short, 6-month delay, in the leasing of property in the area that is known as lease sale 181. This short delay, 6 months from the time the bill is enacted, will allow time to make some important decisions before we are committed to an option that may not be in the best interests of our Nation.

This is also an issue, while it is today in the context of the eastern Gulf of Mexico, the exact same issues which I will speak about are relevant to other areas of the country which share a similar concern, whether or not it is on

the Atlantic coast. I heard this weekend of concerns off the northeast coast regarding a proposal for drilling in areas that have been very significant parts of the American tradition and history of commercial fishing for hundreds of years.

We know our friends who live in the area of the Great Lakes are concerned about proposals for drilling in Lake Huron and Lake Superior—again, areas that have in the past been off limits for drilling. California is another area that has expressed concern about the proposals for drilling under the rules as they currently exist.

While this may be characterized as a Gulf of Mexico issue, or even more specifically a Florida issue, it raises important implications for the Nation. Let me discuss two of those issues which I believe justify the 6-month delay we are requesting through this amendment.

First, the current laws that govern Outer Continental Shelf drilling in my judgment are imbalanced. They do not give proper consideration to other factors in addition to energy production, factors such as economic and environmental needs. We are all aware that America has needs for increased energy production. We are not insensitive to that. But we also are not myopic, that that is the only issue America needs to take in the balance in making these judgments. We believe balanced legislation on Outer Continental Shelf drilling would include the other factors that might be affected by that drilling. Let me give, as an example, what is happening today as a result of our law.

A number of years ago, leases were granted in these areas that are within 40 miles of the coast of Florida. Those are depicted on this map in the light pink and blue. The blue area is what is called Destin Dome. It is an area that is approximately 35 miles south of Pensacola. That lease has been outstanding for a number of years but was dormant. Then a few years ago the owner of that lease, the Chevron Oil Company, made an application for a drilling permit, to start production on that property. What was discovered was that basic environmental analysis, which in my judgment should have preceded the lease being granted in the first place, had not been done and it was deferred until the drilling permit was requested. As an example of those basic studies, one of them is the Coastal Zone Management Act. The Coastal Zone Management Act is administered in a joint program between the U.S. Department of Commerce and the various coastal States affected. The result of that analysis of the Coastal Zone Management Act was a determination by the State of Florida that it was a violation of the act and of the management plan, which had been approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce, to drill on this Destin Dome. That has

now precipitated a series of litigation and administrative actions which have drawn this process out for many years.

In my judgment, the lesson of Destin Dome is let's do the environmental surveys before we grant the lease, before we create the expectations that a lease carries with it, before people apply for the permit to drill, so we have satisfied ourselves on environmental, economic, and the other considerations that this is a property which will be appropriate to drill should a lease be granted.

One of the things we could do, during this 6 months of deferral, would be to do an analysis of our current law to see if it is appropriately representing the wide range of interests that should be considered. We know we are going to be doing a major energy bill sometime in the next few months. Our Republican leader has indicated he thinks that will be on the Senate floor sometime this fall. I know the chairman of the Energy Committee is driving a schedule that would have it considered in committee this month. So we are not talking about long delays. We are talking about legislation that is viable at this moment and would be the appropriate means by which to raise these issues as to whether our current laws are adequate to represent the range of interests.

The second point I would make, that in my opinion justifies the 6-months delay which the House of Representatives has voted by an overwhelming margin, is the very fact of these existing leases outstanding. If we were looking at a map, not a current map but a map as recent as the early 1990s, we would also have seen lots of these little pink squares in this area adjacent to the Florida Keys. What happened there was that there was great concern about the potential adverse effects on one of the most fragile environmental areas in the world, the Florida Keys and their adjacent coral reefs. The President, George Herbert Walker Bush, announced that in his judgment that danger should be eliminated by the Federal Government reacquiring those leases in the vicinity of the Florida Keys. Over a period of less than 10 years, an aggressive program of reacquisition of those leases has, in fact, eliminated those leases.

I believe today we should be entering into negotiation during the administration of George W. Bush to do the same thing in the northern Gulf of Mexico, to eliminate those inappropriate leases that have been granted in years past, that now threaten the beaches of the Panhandle of Florida. Again, the 6-months delay would give us the opportunity, would give us the time to undertake exactly that type of analysis.

This idea is an idea which has been long under consideration. When some of the initial proposals were being made for lease site 181, our former colleague and then Governor of Florida,

the now deceased Governor Lawton Chiles, wrote a letter, on October 28, 1996, to the Director of the Minerals Management Service about lease site 181. In that letter, Governor Chiles made this statement:

A remaining concern, however, is the potential for development of the existing leases in the eastern gulf. I am still quite concerned about the dangers the State's pristine coastline faces from production activities on these leases offshore Northwest Florida.

Governor Chiles was talking about this cluster of leases in the Florida Panhandle section of the north Gulf of Mexico.

While the final program represents a tremendous victory for Florida, I know the victory will not be complete until there are no existing leases off our coast.

This letter is now almost 5 years old and no progress has yet been made towards achieving that goal of eliminating those leases off the coast of Florida. This 6-month period should be a time in which we start the serious negotiations with the current administration of President Bush that proved to be so effective in the administration of his father in eliminating a similar cluster of oil and gas leases in the area of the Florida Keys.

This is not 6 months which would be frittered away. This is 6 months in which we can reexamine the fundamental law that currently governs the leasing of Outer Continental Shelf lands for oil and gas production, to assure that appropriate environmental studies are done before the leases are granted, not after the leases are granted, precipitating the kind of contentious litigation and administrative procedures we have been dealing with as it relates to Destin Dome.

It would also give us 6 months in which we could commence the serious negotiations with the current administration, as was the case in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the administration of the previous President leading to the elimination of the oil and gas leases in the southern Gulf of Mexico.

I believe our request is fair; that it is reasonable; that it has a specific purpose to be accomplished by the brief delay. It is the same amendment that the House of Representatives has already adopted by an overwhelming margin. It is one which I commend to my colleagues in the Senate, not only as it relates to the specific very fragile environmental area of our Nation but also for the precedent that was set in terms of establishing appropriate laws for the future and a reexamination of possibly ill-considered decisions in the past, such as granting these leases in appropriate areas which would be beneficial to all Americans.

I urge adoption of the amendment. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHUMER). Who yields time?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I watched the debate with a great deal of interest. I can only think of the amendment a little while ago that was offered by the Senator from Illinois. The Minerals Management Service has been working on this lease sale for quite a while, and includes the current 5-year Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Program. This was put on the table under the Clinton administration. The service prepared the draft EIS. They have ensured that the proper public hearings have taken place, including the hearings in Pensacola, Tallahassee, and Mobile. But despite the fact that service has jumped through all of the required administrative hoops, some opponents are now trying to foul the whole thing up in the end game right before the lease, of course, is finalized.

When we take a look at the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it is interesting that Members who have been leaning towards voting for this amendment are the same Members who have submitted healthy requests for money out of that Land and Water Conservation Fund for some of their projects. It is also interesting to note that in this very bill, Florida has approximately \$42 million in items that are funded under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is likely that State has been the single largest draw on the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the last 5 years. That money is derived from royalties from offshore drilling and production. It is ironic to note that the State of Florida is actually the third largest consumer of petroleum products. However, it only produces about 2 percent of the petroleum that it consumes.

Basically, this amendment on the surface appears to be one of those "not in my backyard" kinds of situations or games.

To top it off, this amendment totally ignores the fact that last week the administration announced that it decided to reduce the size of the lease sale and in particular decided to make sure that the lease sale is much further away from Florida's shores.

A while ago, we had the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. Now we have the proponents of this amendment pleading with us to heed the local concerns for the protection of Florida's beaches, of which I would concur. I will say right now that I think the offshore drilling probably does less damage than the tankers that go up and down and unload in the Gulf of Mexico every day. They want those decisions to be made locally. But when it comes to voting on an issue that affected the West, they disregarded that.

When voting, I ask my fellow Members to think about the fact that this is a legislative rider that could ultimately reduce the amount of funds contributed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and it might inter-

fere with our country's ability to produce its own oil and gas during a time when the country is facing a very serious energy crunch.

If local concerns are in play in Florida, why aren't they in Montana? I call that the lack of fairness. I think that is all we ever want in this body—fairness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this is a very serious national issue. It is not a Florida issue in any strict legal sense at all.

I used to be the U.S. attorney and represented the Federal Government. I know that these Federal waters are 260 miles away from Tampa, FL. It is a Federal decision about whether to lease it and produce oil and gas from it.

As a resident of Mobile, AL, which is right here at the tip of OCS central planning area, I am pretty familiar with the facts in this case and what happens.

Frankly, I have to say I am a little bit disappointed. The President of the United States, in my view, made a mistake when he cut back huge portions of this lease that is on that map to accommodate and appease the political leaders in Florida. What did he get? They still opposed the sale and are still opposing it right on this floor.

Yet this map shows a dotted line from my hometown of Mobile, AL, over to Tampa, FL. I wonder if anybody knows what those dotted lines reflect. They reflect a pipeline. That pipeline is being built at this moment. It started in June. The pipeline is to take natural gas produced in the western gulf to Tampa, FL, and to south Florida to meet their surging demands for natural gas. Yet when it comes time for them to go along with a national goal of producing natural gas way out in the Gulf of Mexico, far from where you can see it from land, they say: Oh, no. We can never allow that to happen.

They have fought it natural gas production consistently. I am really concerned about this position. We have natural gas here in the Gulf of Mexico. It is being produced off the shores of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. Now they want to transport that gas over to Florida. What is that going to do to the price of natural gas for the homeowners in Alabama and electricity users in Alabama?

They are going to bid it up. This demand on the limited supply in the western Gulf of Mexico is going to drive up the price of natural gas for the people in Alabama; and, at the same time, Florida refuses to allow any production in Federal waters 100 or more miles from their shore.

This is a national issue. One reason, in my view, we have an economic slowdown—and I do not think anybody can dispute it—is an increase in energy

prices. Fifty-seven percent of our fossil fuels comes from outside the country. And that amount is growing. What does that mean? What it means is, American wealth is going overseas to Saudi Arabia, to Venezuela, to Iraq and other foreign countries, to pay for oil and gas that we have right here off our coast. Whom do we pay when we produce it here? We pay us. We pay the United States. We keep American wealth.

The oil companies agreed to pay \$136 million just for the right to bid on this property and are projected to pay \$70 million, at least, per year of royalty. More than that will probably go into the Treasury.

A big chunk of offshore royalty goes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation Fund funds the purchase of parks and recreation areas, estuaries, and to protect environmentally sensitive areas that need to be preserved.

So the question is really simple for Americans: Whom are we going to pay? Are we going to transfer our wealth overseas? Keep it within the United States? Or are we going to send it abroad?

Make no mistake, people act as if the price of energy makes no difference. But when a family had a \$100-a-month gasoline bill several years ago, and now has a \$150-a-month gasoline bill, they have \$50 less per month to spend for things their family needs. It is right out of their pocket. When that \$50—or a big portion of it—is sent over to Saudi Arabia or Iraq and Saddam Hussein, for their oil and gas, we are not helping America.

Let me tell you, we do not just have oil and gas wells off the Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana coast 100 miles away, we have them right up in Mobile Bay, in some instances less than a mile from homes. I drove over to Gulf Shores right near Pensacola this Saturday to visit my brother-in-law, and he was there with his grandson. They were so proud. They had a picture of a 40-pound ling, a great fish. Where did they catch it? Under an oil rig about 1 mile off the gulf shore's coast—1 mile.

We have never had a problem with these oil and gas wells. Offshore oil and gas production in state waters has helped to generate for the State of Alabama a trust fund of \$2 billion. The interest on that fund contributes over 10 percent of our general fund budget on an annual basis.

America has benefited from that. That supply has allowed American money to stay in Alabama and the producing States and not to go off to Saudi Arabia. It has helped to build wealth in America as a whole. You may say: You just want the money for Alabama. The truth is, Alabama is not going to get a dime out of this lease except as any other State would under the Land and Water Conservation

Fund. The proposed lease sale is in Federal waters. It is not in State waters.

But we have produced oil in State waters right off the beaches, right in the bay here, and we have had no problems. People fish around it on a regular basis. It has created a steady flow of income and has been good for America.

The President, in trying to be accommodating, agreed to cut back this lease sale to less than one-quarter of the original area proposed by President Clinton. He tried to do that. He moved it off on the Alabama side—nothing in the Florida waters—to try to accommodate Florida. And the Florida politicians are still not happy. But they want this pipeline built. They want this pipeline built so they can get natural gas. And why do they want the natural gas? Because it is needed to fuel the new cleaner burning electricity plants they need to heat and cool their homes, shops and offices.

What is particularly valuable in the Gulf are the huge reserves of natural gas. The wells in the remaining lease area are going to be a mixture of oil and gas. But the neck, the "stovepipe", that the President shut off as part of his compromise to appease Florida's political leaders was virtually all natural gas.

So I think the Senators from Florida are asking a bit much. I would ask them to think about this. Is not this the philosophy that got California in the fix they are in today? For decades California was facing the question of offshore drilling: No. Nuclear power: No. Coal plants: No. Electric plants: No. And what happened? They have brownouts and prices going through the roof. And they want to blame somebody else. They won't blame themselves.

But energy is going to come from somewhere. It is either going to come from foreign sources or our own sources. We should not threaten our economy. We should not press down on the brow of American working men and women, with the burden of paying 20, 30, 40, cents more a gallon for gasoline, or twice as much perhaps for natural gas to heat their homes to accommodate some sort of political fear that exists out there.

So what I think is important is that we, as America, just relax a little bit. Let's be rational. Let's think this thing through. Let's ask ourselves: What real threat is there? And what are the benefits from producing out there? We simply cannot allow people over in Naples, FL, in their beach houses, worth probably \$2, \$3, \$4 million each, worrying about running their air-conditioners all the time to dictate national energy policy.

Do you know how you generate electricity for air-conditioners in south Florida? They use natural gas because it is efficient and clean burning, much

better than coal. So they want that natural gas. They just do not want it 213 miles or 260 miles away. "Oh, no, we can't have this" they say. I really do not think they know what has happened. I think they have been misled by some politicians and environmentalists who are not responsible.

This is an extreme position. I hate to say that. This is an unhealthy position to have this Senate take. We ought not to adopt this amendment that would stop us from producing oil and gas in one-quarter of the previously approved area. It is going to hurt us in America. It is going to hurt us economically.

The demands in Florida are significant. Thirty percent of all natural gas produced in America comes out of the gulf, and Florida will consume huge amounts. Their demand is going to double in the next 15 years, and increase over 142 percent in the next 20 years, according to experts.

Yes, we should conserve. Yes, I hope people will use those hybrid automobiles. I would like to have one myself. I don't know why everybody doesn't buy one. There must be some reason they don't buy them. If they are so wonderful, why doesn't everybody go out and buy one, if you get 50 miles to the gallon? But I think they have potential. I am interested in looking at them and support the efforts of our automakers to improve efficiency. But it is a free country. Are we going to make everybody go out and buy one?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I will just say that I believe the President has submitted a scaled-down, fair, and reasonable proposal—too scaled down, frankly. It ought to have satisfied those who would object. Unfortunately, it has not. We have had to have this debate. And though it is healthy to have the debate, I am confident that the amendment will be defeated and that this small production area will be opened for the benefit of American taxpayers and the American economy.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, how many minutes remain in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition's time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. How many minutes remaining do I have as the proponent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one minutes twenty-one seconds.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I do not intend to take that. I see all of the staff smiling at me.

But I would like to summarize. I would like to see if I can bring to closure a 3-hour debate on a part of setting any energy policy in this country that is very important not only to us along the gulf coast but to the Nation as a whole.

I want to mark the contrast in the debate that you have heard: Every Senator who has spoken in opposition to this amendment to stop oil drilling off Florida in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area is from an oil State.

That is the beauty of the United States of America. We come, each State represented by two Senators, and bring all of our different interests and constituencies here. But it is an interesting contrast that every opponent to us trying to protect against oil drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico is from an oil State.

Senator GRAHAM, my senior colleague from the State of Florida, has eloquently pointed out a number of things. He pointed out in his summary that these light-colored areas are active leases but no drilling has occurred. Senator GRAHAM and I have offered a bill to buy back these leases, just as President George Herbert Walker Bush had proposed buying back a bunch of leases off of the Ten Thousand Islands off of Naples, off of Fort Myers that occurred about a decade ago. We want to get rid of these, including the lease called the Destin Dome, where Chevron has an active permit to drill.

Let me give you some statistics about Chevron and its offshore rigs in the Gulf of Mexico and what they have experienced between 1956 and 1995.

There were 10 gas blowouts and an additional 5 blowouts of oil and a combination of gas. There were 65 fires and explosions of which at least 28 originated from natural gas, 14 significant pollution incidents, and 40 major accidents, resulting in at least 19 fatalities. There were five pipeline breaks or leaks.

I don't have any particular reason to cite this with regard to Chevron, except that Chevron came up because they have an active lease that is ready to be drilled 30 miles off of some of the world's most beautiful beaches called the Destin Dome. What Senator GRAHAM and I would like to do is to see us buy back that lease so that drilling, with a safety record and a blowout record as has been shown by the facts—and remember, facts are stubborn things—so that that won't occur right off of the sugary white sand beaches of Destin, FL.

We would like to reacquire that lease, just as the first President Bush had acquired so many leases down here threatening the 10,000 islands of the Florida Keys.

That is not the issue here today. The issue today is taking these active drilling leases in the central and western planning areas of the Gulf of Mexico

and thrusting eastward toward the coastline of Florida with a new sale of 1.5 million acres.

They had 6 million acres in this original lease sale 181. They knew they were not going to pass it. They knew there was too much political opposition. So what they have done is they have scaled it back to 1.5 million acres, thinking they can get it through.

It is, in fact, the eastward inevitable march of drilling into the eastern planning area, an area that heretofore has not been violated with this drilling.

Let me cite some more statistics as we wrap up this debate. The Department of the Interior, on the day that the Senate and the House goes home for the Fourth of July, on Monday, July 2, announces this deal, that they are shrinking 181. In the course of that announcement, they put out a news bulletin: Secretary Norton announces area of proposed 181 lease sale on Outer Continental Shelf. And in that, the release states: The area also contains 185 billion barrels of oil.

You have heard the statistics of how much oil is there. The fact is, it is not 185 billion barrels of oil; it is 185 million barrels of oil that MMS, a part of the Department of the Interior, estimates is in this lease sale 181.

So I raise the question again, since this equates to about 10 days' worth of oil and gas energy for this country, is it worth the risk to the beaches of Florida and to the environment of Florida, this eastward march that will inextricably, inexorably happen, is it worth the risk? It is not.

I said earlier in my remarks, if ever I have seen anything that looks like the nose of a camel suddenly under the tent, it is that yellow-colored, 1.5 million acres coming into the eastern planning area that has no drilling.

Back in the middle 1980s, I was a junior Congressman from the east coast of Florida. The Reagan administration had a Secretary of the Interior named James Watt. James Watt was absolutely intent on drilling for oil off the entire eastern coast of the United States and was offering for lease sale leases from as far north as Cape Hatteras, NC, all the way south to Fort Pierce, FL. I went to work, as the Congressman from the middle eastern coast of Florida, to try to defeat that. And we defeated it in the appropriations bill, in an appropriations subcommittee on this very same Interior Department appropriations.

They left me alone. And 2 years later, they came back. This time they had worked the full Appropriations Committee in the House so that they thought they had the votes. And they were running that train down the track for oil drilling from North Carolina to south Florida. The only way that we beat it was to finally get NASA and the Department of Defense to own up to the fact that off the east coast of Flor-

ida, where we were launching the space shuttle, you couldn't have oil rigs out there where you were dropping the solid rocket boosters from the space shuttle launches and where you were dropping off the first stages of the expendable booster rockets that were going out of the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station.

They have left us alone on oil drilling until now. That was almost 16, 17 years.

What we happened to do was call the Pensacola Naval Air Station.

Fast forward 17 years. We decided to call one of the greatest military installations in the world, the naval air station at Pensacola, the place where almost every naval aviator has learned to fly, and we asked if this lease sale 181 were to have a spill—remember, I cited statistics earlier that the Minerals Management Service says this lease sale has up to a 37-percent possibility of having an oil spill—we said to the executive officer at the Naval Air Station Pensacola: What would happen to Pensacola Naval Air Station and to the Air Force installations at Eglin Air Force Base at Fort Walton and Hurlburt Air Force Base near Fort Walton Beach?

No. 1, for both of those military complexes, virtually all testing, training, and operations over water would cease until the oil slick was completely cleaned up.

No. 2, flights would cease due to the hazards to pilots if they had to eject over oily water.

No. 3, water training and equipment testing would cease.

No. 4, test firing of weapons would cease over and into oily water.

In other words, the Pensacola Naval Air Station would virtually cease to operate as one of our greatest national assets.

We have not even talked about something that is a natural phenomenon in the State of Florida. Look at this peninsula. It is a land that I call paradise, but paradise happens to be a peninsula that sticks down into something known as hurricane highway, for in the course of the summer and into the early fall, because the Lord designed the Earth this way, hurricanes spring up in the gulf, they spring up in the Atlantic, and they go from the Atlantic into the gulf. It is an additional reminder of the additional hazards of Florida offshore oil drilling.

As we bring to a close this 3-hour debate, the risk of spill, according to the Government, on this lease sale 181 is all the way up to 37 percent. This lease sale, by the Department's own recognition, is only going to have about 10 days of oil and gas for the entire country. It is not going to lessen the dependence on foreign oil.

My goodness, the United States has 5 percent of the world's population, 3 percent of the reserves, but we consume 25 percent of the world's oil. We

cannot drill our way out of dependence on foreign oil. We have to have a balanced energy policy which includes the use of technology to get greater miles-per-gallon in our transportation, as well as conservation, as well as being balanced with drilling.

I recite the statistic I cited that of all the future reserves, they are not in the eastern gulf planning area. Sixty percent of the Nation's undiscovered economically recoverable Outer Continental Shelf oil is in the central and western gulf area where they are already drilling, and for natural gas, of the entire Outer Continental Shelf, 80 percent of the future reserves are from the central and western areas, not from the eastern area.

I come back to the point at which we began 3 hours ago: Is it worth the risk? Is it worth the tradeoff: Little oil and gas, and yet the first invasion of the eastern planning area, a huge invasion, a million and a half acres? Is it worth the risk to an economy of a State that has pristine, white sandy beaches on which its economy is so dependent because of a \$50 billion-a-year tourism economy? Is it worth it to the estuaries of Apalachicola, the Big Ben, and the Ten Thousand Islands, Tampa Bay, and the Caloosahatchee River, and the sandy beaches from Tampa all the way to Marco Island? It is not worth the risk. It is not worth the tradeoff.

That is why for years we see, as depicted by the green color, the active drilling leases off Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, but not off Florida in the eastern planning area of the gulf.

I know the White House is putting on a full-court press. I know the oil and gas industry, through all of their innumerable lobbyists, are putting on a full-court press. We heard the Senators from each of the oil States. Not one non-oil-producing State spoke against this today. Yet we have our hands full because the full court lobbying press by every special interest involved in drilling in oil and gas is going to be working this issue as hard as it can before our vote that is going to occur sometime late tomorrow morning.

I ask my colleagues to consider the risk to their Outer Continental Shelf and to consider what is in the best interest of the Nation.

I am deeply honored that this is one of the first great debates in which I have engaged, in which I have joined so many of those with whom I argued in many of the other debates, such as budget, education, and the Patients' Bill of Rights. This, however, is one of the great debates that will take place, and it is an honor for me to have participated in it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, OCS Lease Sale 181 is an essential element of a national energy policy that will provide affordable and secure supply of energy.

Sale 181, the most promising domestic opportunity for newly-available leases in many years is a resource rich area for new supplies of natural gas and oil. It will play an important role in meeting the Nation's energy needs.

Sale 181 is the work-product of more than five years of planning and preparation by the Federal Government, affected States, and industry, and should proceed as scheduled in December 2001.

The Nation's demand for natural gas is expected to grow significantly.

According to a 1999 National Petroleum Council study, the nation's demand for natural gas is expected to increase by 32 percent to 29 trillion cubic feet by 2010 and by 41 percent to 31 trillion cubic feet by 2015.

Current demand is 22 trillion cubic feet. Natural gas is essentially a North American commodity.

If the Nation is to meet its growing natural gas demand, access to gas resource rich areas like the Sale 181 area is an indispensable element of the energy policy agenda.

Major reserves of oil and natural gas are believed to exist in the eastern gulf. According to a study conducted in conjunction with the 1999 National Petroleum Council study, the Sale 181 area may hold 7.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 1.9 billion barrels of oil.

This is enough natural gas to supply 4.6 million households for 20 years and enough oil to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for three and one-half years or make enough gasoline to fuel 3.1 million cars for 20 years.

This is also three and one-half times the amount of oil currently in the Strategic Petroleum Reserves.

Sale 181 was recently modified to ensure a balance between state and federal interests.

Key affected constituencies including Alabama, Florida, and the Department of Defense were consulted during development of the current five-year plan to ensure that all concerns were addressed.

For example, the sale area was drawn to insure it was consistent with the State of Florida's request for no oil and gas activities within 100 miles of its coast, including limiting the number of tracts offered for lease.

In 1996, Florida Governor Lawton Chiles expressed appreciation to MMS for developing a program that recognized the need to exclude any tracts within 100 miles of Florida's coasts.

The sale area, with full recognition by Florida, including Florida congressional delegation, was specifically excluded from current leasing moratoria language under both Congressional action and President Clinton's 1998 Executive order.

Other tracts are expected to be deferred to assure smooth operations when the military and industry operate in the same area.

Sale 181 is a regional opportunity that impacts 5 Gulf States; all 5 Gulf States were consulted. Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas support Sale 181.

These States will enjoy significant economic benefits as a result of exploration and production activities in the area.

In addition, the coastal area of Louisiana will be the most heavily impacted of the five States.

The impact on Florida will be minimal. Many tracts in the sale area are closer to Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama than to Florida. In fact, Cuba is closer to Florida shore than is this lease.

Parts of the sale area come within about 40 miles of Mississippi, 64 miles of Louisiana, and about 18 miles of Alabama.

Florida could benefit significantly from Sale 181. Florida's population is expected to grow by 29 percent between now and 2020.

Florida's total demand for natural gas is expected to grow by 142 percent during the same period.

About two-thirds of this growth in demand is for natural gas to generate electricity.

Some of the potential 7.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that could be produced from Sale 181 could help meet the State's significant demand for natural gas during this time.

Making more natural gas available to Florida utilities for electricity generation should lead to better air quality in the state.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to clarify for the RECORD why I voted to table the Durbin amendment to H.R. 2217, the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002.

First of all, once national monuments are designated, similar to other federal designations, those lands are withdrawn from any further mining activity, with exception to existing leases. My understanding is that nearly all of the recent monuments designated by the prior Administration are protected in this manner. Only one of the newly established monuments in Colorado has specific provisions in its proclamation that could potentially allow some type of oil or gas mining development. Unless the Congress or the President by executive action changes the terms of the original proclamation that established these monuments, these lands areas are protected. I would imagine that such changes would be difficult to approve.

The second reason I opposed this amendment is that I object to the process by which many of these monuments were designated by the previous Administration. If important land use issues like this one had been thoroughly evaluated during an open and fair public process prior to the monument designation, the Senate would

not have to vote on this type of amendment. The use of the 1906 Antiquities Act is not an appropriate way to unilaterally cut off millions of acres of land from public use by fiat nor does it allow for the type of open and fair input to those living and working on and near those lands. Our democratic process should promote such procedural fairness and consultation.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, no matter what other issues are discussed in this Senate, what other concerns are brought before the body, the Nation's attention is turned again to the issue of campaign finance reform, the seemingly never-ending effort to restore integrity to this process and change the Nation's campaign finance laws.

In March, the Senate passed a comprehensive and workable piece of legislation; it required 2 weeks and 22 amendments. One of those amendments I offered together with my colleagues, Senator CORZINE, Senator DURBIN, and Senator ENSIGN. It was the other part of the equation: As we reduce the amount of money that is raised, to reduce the amount that must by necessity be spent.

Campaign spending in America is easily defined. It is used for television overwhelmingly: 80 or 85 percent of the cost of the Senate campaign goes to a television network.

This amendment was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate. I take the floor today because it is now in jeopardy. It is unconscionable, while the American people have demanded a control on the amount of political money being spent in America, unconscionable while this Congress has fought for campaign finance reform, the broadcast industry is fighting to the death to reverse this amendment in the House of Representatives and allow the television networks to charge whatever they want to charge for political advertising.

I take the floor today as one who has voted for campaign finance reform since I came to the Congress 18 years ago. I have always voted for campaign finance reform. I always want to vote for it because I believe the system must be fundamentally changed to restore integrity to the system and gain the confidence of the American people.

I take the floor to make this very clear: Reducing campaign fundraising without reducing the cost of campaigns

is not reform. That reduces the amount of communication. It makes it more difficult for the political parties and candidates to communicate their message. This cannot be reform. This is silencing political debate in America.

The bill that passed this Senate reduced the amount of soft money, eliminated the amount of soft money and, correspondingly, in a balanced fashion, dealt with this cost of advertising.

In 1971, the Congress believed we had faced this problem and required the charging of the lowest unit charge. Over 30 years, the law became ineffective. That is why I offered this amendment. This chart shows, by 1990, an audit by the FEC found that 80 percent of television stations were failing to give the lowest rate. These are examples from around the country. The price of a typical ad is a percent greater than the lowest rate that should have been offered: NBC in New York, 21 percent higher than by law should have been charged; WXYZ in Detroit, 124 percent; KGO, San Francisco, 62 percent higher than the lowest rate. These are the numbers that convinced 69 Democrats and Republicans in the Senate to pass this amendment.

The second reason for the amendment is that stations are charging candidates the lowest rate, looking back 365 days. So they cannot simply charge the lowest rate available on that day, which they were not doing anyway, but had to look back for what was the lowest rate during the course of the year. The fact is, the broadcast industry in America has been profiteering at the expense of the political system. There is not another democracy in the world where the public airwaves, licensed to private companies, are used for profiteering and price gouging when a public candidate attempts to communicate with people in the country.

The patterns are quite clear. This chart indicates the percentage of ads sold above or below the lowest unit cost per station. Below the unit rate, Philadelphia, KYW, 9 percent; Detroit, XYZ, 8 percent; Los Angeles, one of the better in the country, is only 63 percent. NBC in New York, 15 percent of their ads are sold in accordance with the 1971 law at the lowest unit rate.

It isn't that the law is not being obeyed; it is being violated wholesale. Compliance with the law is the rare, rare, exception.

Here is the magnitude of the problem. In the 2000 political season, political advertisers spent \$1 billion on television ads; \$1 billion was raised, fundraiser by fundraiser, mailer by mailer, telephone call by telephone call. And an extraordinary percentage of this advertising, if it had been paid for at the lowest unit rate, would have saved hundreds of millions of dollars in political fundraising.

My message out of this, I hope, is clear. I speak not to my colleagues, but

I speak to the broadcast industry, to the network televisions, which since the 2000 Presidential campaign have carried on a campaign of their own, criticizing the political community, attacking individual candidates, railing against the problems of political fundraising.

Instead of being part of the problem, be part of the solution. Campaign finance reform does not simply mean the Democrat and Republican Parties. It means ABC, NBC, CBS. It means you. Get your lobbyists out of the House of Representatives, out of these Chambers, and be part of a solution of campaign finance reform. Allow a balanced piece of legislation to pass this Congress that deals with this problem.

The National Association of Broadcasters has been fighting against this provision in an exercise of their own greed on two myths: First, that this will lead to perpetual campaigns because the low rates will mean this will go on and on forever in advertising.

That simply is not the case. The look-back will only allow the lowest rates for 365 days. Mr. SHAYS and MEEHAN have only proposed 180 days. That is the extent, in the primary season, campaigns are taking place anyway. The campaigns will not be longer; they will just be less expensive. And that is the problem for the broadcasters.

Second, that this is somehow unconstitutional, that we are taking private property. For 30 years this has already been the law. The broadcasters, as a condition of their license, are required to do public broadcasting, sometimes children's broadcasting. They comply with all kinds of Federal requirements as a condition of having a public license. This is one more, but it is not even a new requirement. For 30 years we have required them to sell at the lowest unit rate. They simply are not doing it. We are just strengthening the law; we are not fundamentally changing the law.

Third, they allege the amendment could force a TV station to sell a 30-second spot during a prime time television show for a de minimus amount of money. Actually, that would not be bad if it were true, but it is not. The FCC, in mediating pricing disputes under the law as it now stands, has always taken viewership levels into account, that they must be comparable. You cannot take a 2 o'clock in the morning television show that sells at a discount rate and compare it with prime time. It simply is not true.

Fourth, the broadcasters say lowering the costs of candidate advertising will result in candidates running more ads. As my friend MITCH MCCONNELL commented on occasion, the Nation does not suffer from too much political discussion. It would not be a bad thing if there were more advertising, discussing more issues. But that is probably not the result of this amendment.